DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 588 EC 308 192

AUTHOR Zhang, Dalun; Stecker, Pamela M.
TITLE Infusing Self-Determination into Transition Planning: Current Practice and Recommendations.
PUB DATE 2000-05-00
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Mental Retardation (124th, Washington, D.C., May 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; Education Work Relationship; High Schools; *Individualized Education Programs; *Mild Mental Retardation; *Self Determination; *Student Participation; Teacher Characteristics; Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Individualized Transition Plans

ABSTRACT

Involvement of students with mild mental retardation (MMR) in the transition planning process was evaluated through interviews with 44 secondary teachers of students with MMR. The interviews focused on behaviors of the teacher and Individualized Education Program (IEP) team members before and during the transition planning meeting as well as student behaviors before, during, and after the meeting. Analysis, using an index of teacher/IEP team behaviors, revealed three major findings: (1) although the majority of teachers indicated that they identified students' needs, interests, and references prior to the transition planning meeting, many fewer teachers reported incorporating these variables into the transition plan; (2) higher scores were observed for teachers with less experience in teaching, no previous experience in transition planning, and lower level degrees, with no association found between certification in mental retardation and scores on the index measure; and (3) a trend of relatively little active participation by all students in their own transition planning was revealed. Results supported two recommendations: the need to teach students with MMR self-determination skills and strategies for involvement in transition planning and the need to provide adequate training to teachers and other IEP team members. (Contains 45 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: INFUSING SELF-DETERMINATION

ED 449 588

Infusing Self-Determination into Transition Planning:

Current Practice and Recommendations

Dalun Zhang & Pamela M. Stecker

Clemson University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Zhang

2A

Ec 308192

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

After a decade of research on self-determination of individuals with disabilities, it is now widely recognized that student involvement in the transition planning process is critical to their transition success. However, little is known about the extent to which students with mild mental retardation (MMR) are involved in the planning and implementation of their transition services. The current study examined this status by interviewing 44 secondary teachers of students with MMR. The interview focused on teacher/IEP team behaviors before and during the transition planning meeting and student behaviors before, during, and after the meeting. Results revealed three major findings. First, although the majority of the teachers indicated that they identified students' needs, interests, and preferences prior to the transition planning meeting, many fewer teachers reported incorporating these variables into the transition plan. Likewise, fewer teachers reported listening to the student/family vision of the student's future. Second, higher scores were observed for teachers with (a) less experience in teaching, (b) no previous experience in transition planning, and (c) lower level degrees. Certification in MR was not associated with the index of teacher/IEP team behaviors. Third, a trend of relatively little active participation across all students in their own transition planning was revealed by this study. Although students were somewhat involved from a technical standpoint during transition meetings, teachers judged that their students did not demonstrate high levels of self-determined transition behaviors overall. Based on the result of the study, two recommendations were provided: teaching students with MMR self-determination skills and strategies for involvement in transition planning, and providing adequate training to teachers and other IEP team members.

Infusing Self-Determination into Transition Planning: Current Practice and Recommendations

In the past decade, self-determination has received increased attention from researchers in the field of special education and disability services. Self-determination refers to "acting as the primary causal agent in one's life and making choices and decisions regarding one's quality of life free from undue external influence or interference" (Wehmeyer, 1996, p. 24). Much research has been focused on seven key areas: (a) building theoretical frameworks and models (Abery, 1994; Field & Hoffman, 1994; Wehmeyer, 1997); (b) defining self-determination (Hoffman & Field, 1995; Powers, Sowers, et al., 1996; Ward, 1988; Wehmeyer, 1992); (c) identifying components of self-determination (Field, 1996; Wehmeyer, Kelchner, & Richards, 1996); (d) identifying personal and environmental factors that affect the acquisition of self-determination (Brotherson, Cook, Cuncinan-Lahr, & Wehmeyer, 1995; Field, Hoffman, & Posch, 1997; Ludi & Martin, 1995; Wehmeyer, Kelchner, & Richards, 1995); (e) investigating the relationship between self-determination and student success in academic performance and in adult outcomes (Wehmeyer, 1994; Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1997); (f) developing self-determination curricula or programs to facilitate the development of self-determination skills (Halpern et al., 1997; Martin & Marshall, 1995; Powers, 1996; Wehmeyer & Kelchner, 1995); and (g) studying the subcomponents of self-determination, including autonomy, choice making, decision making, motivation, and self-control (Baron & Brown, 1991; Deci, Hodges, Pierson, & Tomassone, 1992; Gothelf, Crimmins, Mercer, & Finocchiaro, 1994; Guess, Benson, & Siegel-Causey, 1985; Hannum, 1990; Lewis & Taymans, 1992; Martino, 1993; Murtaugh & Zetlin, 1990).

Recently, the focus of research on self-determination has shifted toward involving students with disabilities in their transition planning activities. This shift occurred because of two

reasons. First, amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) required that students ages 14 and older be invited to participate in their own transition planning meetings. Second, researchers and practitioners began to realize the importance of self-determination in planning transition services for individuals with disabilities (Wehmeyer & Sands, 1998). On the one hand, students with disabilities must possess self-determination skills to help them make successful transitions to adulthood (Field, 1996; Wehmeyer, 1997; Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1997). On the other hand, professionals working with students to plan their transitions must incorporate the concept of self-determination into transition planning practices by encouraging student participation, listening to the student, and involving the student in educational decision making (Doll & Sands, 1998). Field, Martin, Miller, Ward, and Wehmeyer (1998) suggest that professionals should think about student involvement in transition and educational planning from the student's point of view and should ask themselves what they would do if other people discussed their future without their involvement. Wehmeyer (1998) asserts that involving students in transition and educational planning can benefit both the student and the transition process.

However, three questions regarding transition planning practices in the field remain. First, to what extent do IEP team members' behaviors or activities encourage student's active participation? Second, to what extent do students with mild mental retardation (MMR) demonstrate self-determination behaviors before, during, and after the transition planning meeting? Third, what specific recommendations can be provided for future practice? The purpose of this article is to provide our answers to these three questions. Specifically, we report a study that investigated the current practice of infusing self-determination into the transition

planning process and then discuss implications of this study in order to provide recommendations for future practice.

Method

The current study involved survey methodology. We used oral interviews as the means of data collection.

Participants

A total of 44 secondary teachers of students with MMR participated in this study. These teachers were from four school districts in two southern states and were selected from lists obtained from the four school districts. Once the teachers were identified, we asked each of them to select randomly a student with MMR from his or her classes, ranging from Grades 9 to 12. We requested that the teachers use their selected student's case in answering interview questions.

All 44 teachers held a degree in special education and were certified in special education. The types of degrees included 28 (64%) bachelor's, 15 (34%) master's, and 1 (2%) master's with additional credit hours. Among them, 26 (59%) were certified in the area of mental retardation. Thirty-four (77%) of these teachers reported that they had been involved previously in students' transition planning. The 44 students whose cases were used in this study included 28 males (64%) and 16 females (36%). Their ages ranged from 14 to 17, with an average of 15.3 years. All of them were classified as having MMR.

Instrument

The first author developed the survey instrument based on a review of literature on self-determination and its implications for transition planning. This researcher asked three teachers, a parent, and a university professor to review the draft instrument. The following suggestions by the reviewers were incorporated into the final instrument: (a) reordering the questions to

correspond with the logical sequence of transition planning activities, (b) using a tabular format to organize the interview questions, and (c) adding items to capture information about the student's actions to track progress during the academic year. The final instrument consisted of two sections. Section I requested participant demographic information regarding certification, degree, and experience in transition planning. Section II consisted of three tables of statements regarding IEP member and student behaviors to be exhibited before, during, and after a transition planning meeting (see Figure 1). Each participant ranked the observance of these behaviors according to the following scale: "frequently," "occasionally," "rarely," and "never." Statements in the first and second tables were teacher and IEP team member behaviors that would lead to student's self-determination behaviors before and during transition planning meetings, respectively. The third table contained statements of student self-determination behaviors before, during, and after transition planning meetings.

Procedure

A trained graduate assistant and the first author collected the data through personal interviews. When conducting an interview, the interviewer read the directions and each question to the participant and asked him or her to provide a rating. To help the participant follow along, the interviewer provided a copy of the instrument to the participant. Personal interviews were held to make sure that all study participants were involved and to ensure that each item was answered.

Data Coding and Analysis

Demographic data were coded as 1 = "yes" and 0 = "no." The ranked behaviors were coded as 3 = "frequently," 2 = "occasionally," 1 = "rarely," and 0 = "never," except for two IEP team behaviors during the meeting. Because the last two statements in the second table (see

Figure 1) were written in a negative way, the answers to these items were coded in a reverse order: 0 = "frequently," 1 = "occasionally," 2 = "rarely," and 3 = "never."

Three steps were taken in data analysis. In Step 1, descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were calculated for each item across all 44 participants. In Step 2, the compute procedure in SPSS was used to prepare data for inferential analyses. First, the compute procedure was used to sum each participant's ratings of the four premeeting behaviors, which resulted in a new variable serving as an index of IEP teams' premeeting behaviors. Likewise, the compute procedure was used to establish an index of the IEP team's behaviors during the transition meeting and an index of student self-determination behaviors. These three variables were used as the dependent variables in the third step of the analysis, where three series of independent t tests were conducted to examine group differences.

The first series included four independent t tests. The dependent variable for these four tests was the index of IEP team behaviors before the transition planning meeting. The four independent variables included teacher experience (5 years or less vs. more than 5 years), teacher degree (bachelor's vs. higher than bachelor's), certification in MR (certified vs. noncertified), and experience in transition planning (experienced vs. nonexperienced). In the second series of t tests, the same independent variables were used. The dependent variable was the index of IEP team behaviors during the meeting. The third series included three t tests. The dependent variable was the index of student self-determination behaviors. The independent variables were student age (15 and younger vs. 16 and older), student grade level (Grade 9 or lower vs. Grade 10 and higher), and student gender (male vs. female).

Results

IEP Team Behaviors Before the Transition Planning Meeting

Table 1 contains a summary of the 44 participants' rating in terms of how frequently the teacher and IEP team members exhibited each of the four listed behaviors before the transition planning meeting. As indicated in Table 1, 37 (84%) of the participants reported that the teacher/IEP team frequently identified student needs before IEP meetings and 31 (71%) reported that the teacher/IEP team frequently identified student interests and preferences. However, with regard to listening to the student/family about their future vision, only 27 (61%) did it frequently, 12 (27%) occasionally, 4 (10%) rarely, and 1 (2%) never. In terms of incorporating student/family's need, interests, and preferences into the transition plan, the data show 27 (62%) frequently, 16 (36%) rarely, and 1 (2%) never considered student/family factors.

In Table 2, results of four t tests are presented. The dependent variable for the t tests was index of IEP teams' premeeting behaviors. The four independent variables were teacher experience, teacher degree, certification in MR, and experience in transition planning. As indicated in Table 2, less experienced teachers provided higher ratings on the premeeting behaviors than more experienced teachers, teachers with lower degrees provided higher ratings than teachers with higher degrees, and teachers with no experience in transition planning provided higher ratings than those with experience in transition planning. All these differences were statistically significant. However, no statistically significant difference occurred between the ratings of teachers with MR certification and those of teachers without MR certification.

Insert Tables 1 & 2 about here

IEP Team Behaviors During the Transition Planning Meeting

The 44 participants' ratings of IEP team behaviors during the transition planning meeting are summarized in Table 3. Of the nine behaviors, having the student and/or family sign the transition plan after they understand and agree with the plan received the highest rating (90% rated frequently). Responding to student/family questions received the second highest rating (86% frequently and 12% occasionally), followed by providing the student/family sufficient time for asking questions (77% frequently and 21% occasionally). As a contrast, 14 (32%) of the participants reported that the teacher or IEP team frequently or occasionally did not consider the opinions of the student and parents because they did not come to the transition planning meeting; 13 (30%) reported that the teacher developed the transition plans for the student without or with little input from the student/family.

Table 4 contains the results of the four t tests using the index of IEP team behaviors during transition planning meetings as the dependent variable. The four independent variables were teacher experience, teacher degree, certification in MR, and experience in transition planning. Results of these t tests indicated similar patterns as those in the previous t tests. Less experienced teachers provided higher ratings on the during-meeting behaviors than more experienced teachers, teachers with lower degrees provided higher ratings than teachers with higher degrees, and teachers with no experience in transition planning provided higher ratings than those with experience in transition planning. All these differences were statistically significant. However, no statistically significant difference occurred between the ratings of teachers with MR certification and those of teachers without MR certification.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

Student Behaviors Before, During, and After the Transition Planning Meeting

Data about students' self-determination behaviors before, during, and after the transition planning meeting are summarized in Table 5. Ratings of the five behaviors under investigation generally were skewed toward the "rarely" and "never" categories. Meeting with school personnel to discuss the transition plan after the meeting received the lowest rating (34% never, 55% rarely), followed by asking questions about the plan and wanting to know progress during the academic year (46% never, 30% rarely, and 21% occasionally). Results of three t tests using the index of student behaviors as the dependent variable yielded no statistically significant differences between the two age groups, between the two grade-level groups, and between student genders.

Insert Table 5 about here

Discussion

Summary of Major Findings

IEP team members' behaviors. Our first research question addressed the extent to which IEP team members' behaviors or activities encouraged active student participation in the transition process. Study results revealed three major findings. First, although the majority of the teachers indicated that they identified students' needs, interests, and preferences prior to the transition planning meeting, many fewer teachers reported incorporating these variables into the transition plan. Likewise, fewer teachers reported listening to the student/family vision of the student's future. Second, items that were ranked as occurring the most frequently were related to compliance practices, such as having students/parents sign the transition plan, responding to student/parent questions, providing think time for formulating/asking questions, and providing

time to review the transition plan. Third, higher scores were observed for teachers with (a) less experience in teaching, (b) no previous experience in transition planning, and (c) lower level degrees. Certification in MR was not associated with the index of teacher/IEP team behaviors.

Student behaviors. The second research question focused on the extent to which students with MMR demonstrated self-determination behaviors before, during, and after the transition planning meeting. The index of student behaviors before, during, and after the transition meeting was examined for differences between student demographic variables; however, no statistically significant differences in self-determination behaviors were observed for student age, grade level, and gender. Teacher rankings across all five of the student-related questions revealed low levels of active student participation.

Interpretation of the Findings

IEP team members' behaviors. One could easily hypothesize that teachers with more experience in transition planning or those teachers with additional degrees (i.e., master's degrees or master's with additional hours) would be engaged in more behaviors prior to and during transition meetings that facilitated student/family participation. This study, however, revealed the opposite finding. One interpretation could be that teachers who have been prepared more recently (i.e., recent graduates with bachelor's degrees) have more knowledge and skills related to transition planning. Considering that transition planning was initially mandated by IDEA only a decade ago and that IDEA amendments of only a few years ago lowered the age for required participation of students in their own transition planning, less experienced teachers actually may have received more focused training in transition practices. This interpretation is limited by the fact that we did not determine when teachers received their degrees. If this interpretation is accurate, however, it indicates that university teacher preparation programs may be more

successful in infusing transition planning and delivery of services in their training than are local school staff development programs.

Likewise, having had prior experience with transition practices may not yield effective practices. For example, Furney, Hasazi, and DeStefano (1997) illustrated that, although some states had implemented exemplary transition practices in compliance with the added transition requirements in the 1990 reauthorization of IDEA, some states had not. Moreover, transition plans may comply technically with IDEA mandates but still lack some key components, indicating the absence of careful or thoughtful planning (Grigal, Test, Beattie, & Wood, 1997).

No differences were observed for teachers with or without certification in MR. This finding is not particularly surprising, given that transition planning is required for all students with disabilities and that all of the teachers involved in this study possessed some type of special education certification.

Student behaviors. Neither age nor grade-level differences were observed for rankings of student behaviors. These variables were examined in light of recent IDEA amendments that lowered the required age for student participation in transition planning. Although this result could be interpreted initially as a positive finding, a disturbing trend of relatively little active participation across all students in their own transition planning was revealed by this study. Although students were somewhat involved from a technical standpoint during transition meetings, teachers judged that their students did not demonstrate high levels of self-determined transition behaviors overall.

Teachers did report that students were more involved in the transition planning process prior to and during the meetings than they were following the meetings. These rankings of student behaviors appear to corroborate teachers' separate ratings of their own or IEP team

members' facilitation of student involvement. Unfortunately, the relatively infrequent involvement by students following the transition meeting cannot be compared to level of activity by the teacher or team following the transition meetings. We only can speculate that these low levels of student involvement were related, at least in part, to infrequent activities on the part of teachers or the team.

Although more males were involved in the study, no differences in student ratings were observed for gender. This finding could be interpreted somewhat more positively given that females with mental retardation or learning disabilities are less likely to find competitive employment than their male counterparts and actually earn less if employed (Sitlington & Frank, 1993). Perhaps self-determination behaviors in high school contribute in only a small way to this unfortunate discrepancy in employment practices.

Limitations. Typical limitations with respect to survey research methodology must be kept in mind. Self-report data may not be reliable; for example, teachers could have reported inflated rankings during oral interviews in an effort to "please" the researchers. Also, findings could not be corroborated by observational data. Additionally, no efforts on the part of teachers following the transition planning meetings were assessed. We only can speculate that one reason students were not actively involved after transition meetings was that teachers did not prepare students for this role. Questions concerning family involvement were asked of teachers, but no information was collected directly from parents to examine their perceptions or to corroborate teachers' rankings.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Our third purpose of the study was to consider study results in highlighting recommendations for future practice in the transition planning process. Based on the available

data, it is clear that student involvement in the transition planning process needs improvement. According to Zhang (1999), barriers to active student involvement in transition planning stem from two major sources: from the students themselves and from other people. "Learned helplessness" is the main barrier occurring from students themselves that makes them believe that they are not capable of being involved in their own transition planning (Powers et al., 1996). Barriers from other people stem from the belief that students with disabilities do not have the capacity and motivation to make informed choices during the complex transition process (Wehmeyer, 1998). Our recommendations for future practices are focused mainly on overcoming these two sources of barriers.

Teaching students with MMR self-determination skills and strategies for involvement in transition planning. Research indicates that self-determined students are more outspoken on their own behalf and are more involved in transition planning than are students with less self-determination (Hoffman & Field, 1995; Wehmeyer, 1995; Wehmeyer, 1998). However, research also reveals that individuals with MMR often lack self-determination skills due to their experiences of failure and infrequent opportunities to make choices and decisions (Wehmeyer, 1997). Therefore, it is critical that these skills be taught to individuals with MMR. Because developing self-determination skills is a long-term task, a combination of three approaches may be necessary. The first approach involves fostering self-determination during daily activities beginning in early childhood. The second approach is to involve students with MMR frequently in classroom educational decision-making processes. These two approaches provide opportunities for individuals with MMR to exercise choice-making, decision-making, and problem-solving skills on a daily basis. By so doing, they learn how to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses and how to deal with risk factors. The third approach is to offer a

stand-alone, self-determination curriculum to secondary students with MMR. The purpose of such a course is to provide students with effective skills and strategies for active engagement in their own transition planning. Some curricula that serve this purpose include: (a) Become Your Own Expert (Carpenter, 1995); (b) Next S.T.E.P. (Halpern et al., 1997); (c) Self-Advocacy Strategy for Education and Transition Planning (Van Reusen, Bos, Schumaker, & Deshler, 1994); (d) The Self-Directed IEP (Martin, Marshall, Maxson, Jerman, & Miller, 1996); (e) A Student Guide to the IEP (McGahee-Kovac, 1995); (f) Take Charge for the Future (Powers, 1996); and (g) Whose Future Is It Anyway? (Wehmeyer & Kelchner, 1995).

Providing adequate training to teachers and other IEP team members. Adults serving student IEP teams often either do not believe that students with MMR have the capacity to be involved meaningfully in their transition planning or do not know how to involve students actively. Traditionally, training of educational professionals and rehabilitation counselors does not include the involvement of students with disabilities in the educational decision-making process. We recommend that both preservice and inservice programs make concerted efforts to develop transition-related knowledge and skills among teachers and related personnel. A specifically designed training program should be made available for preparing transition specialists, and this program should be developed according to The Council for Exceptional Children's newly added standards for the preparation of transition specialists (see CEC, 2000). Moreover, we recommend that secondary special education preparation programs require at least one course that addresses transition from school to adulthood. Prepared materials for infusing transition content into existing coursework are available through Martin and Kohler's (1999) curriculum, Transition from School to Life. Sitlington, Clark, and Kolstoe (2000) curriculum,

Transition Education and Services for Adolescents with Disabilities, can be used as a stand-lone curriculum for this purpose.

Self-determination is critical to success in adulthood. Results of the current study indicated that both individuals with MMR and the professionals working with them need to be more actively engaged in the development of student-directed behaviors before, during, and after transition-planning meetings. The current questionnaire could serve as one tool to help ensure that students' self-determination behaviors are being facilitated and maintained throughout the transition planning process.

References

Abery, B. (1994). A conceptual framework for enhancing self-determination. In M. Hayden & B. Abery (Eds.), Challenges for a service system in transition (pp. 345-380). Baltimore: Brookes.

Baron, J., & Brown, R. V. (Eds.). (1991). Teaching decision making to adolescents. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brotherson, M. J., Cook, C. C., Cuncinan-Lahr, R. C., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (1995). Policy supporting self-determination in the environments of children with disabilities. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 30, 3-14.

Carpenter, W. D. (1995). Become your own expert! Minneapolis: Cognitive Learning Consultants.

The Council for Exceptional Children. (2000). What every special educator must know: The standards for the preparation and licensure of special educators (4th ed.). Reston, VA: Author.

Deci, E. L., Hodges, R., Pierson, L. & Tomassone, J. (1992). Autonomy and competence as motivational factors in students with learning disabilities and emotional handicaps. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25, 457-471.

Doll, B. & Sands, D. J. (1998). Student involvement in goal setting and educational decision making: Foundations for effective instruction. In M. L. Wehmeyer & D. J. Sands (Eds.), Making it happen: Student involvement in education planning, decision making, and instruction. Baltimore: Brookes.

Field, S. (1996). Self-determination instructional strategies for youth with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29(1), 40-52.

Field, S., & Hoffman, A. (1994). Development of a model for self-determination. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 17, 159-169.

Field, S., Hoffman, A., & Posch, M. (1997). Self-determination during adolescence: A developmental perspective. Remedial and Special Education, 18, 285-293.

Field, S., Martin, J., Miller, R., Ward, M., & Wehmeyer, M. (1998). A practical guide for teaching self-determination. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Furney, K. S., Hasazi, S. B., & DeStefano, L. (1997). Transition policies, practices, and promises: Lessons from three states. Exceptional Children, 63, 343-355.

Gothelf, C. R., Crimmins, D. B., Mercer, C. A., & Finocchiaro, P. A. (1994). Teaching choice-making skills to students who are deaf-blind. Teaching Exceptional Children, 26 (4), 13-15.

Grigal, M., Test, D. W., Beattie, J., & Wood, W. M. (1997). An evaluation of transition components of individualized education programs. Exceptional Children, 63, 357-372.

Guess, D., Benson, H. A., & Siegel-Causey, E. (1985). Concepts and issues related to choice-making and autonomy among persons with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10(2), 79-86.

Halpern, A. S., Herr, C. M., Wolf, N. K., Doren, B., & Johnson, M. D., Lawson, J. D. (1997). NEXT S.T.E.P.: Student transition and educational planning. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Hannum, H. (1990). Autonomy, sovereignty, and self-determination: The accommodation of conflicting rights. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Hoffman, A. & Field, S. (1995). Promoting self-determination through effective curriculum development. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 134-141.

Lewis, K., & Taymans, J. M. (1992). An examination of autonomous functioning skills of adolescents with learning disabilities. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 15 (1), 37-46.

Ludi, D. C., & Martin, L. (1995). The road to personal freedom: Self-determination. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 147-156.

Martin, J. E., & Kohler, P. D. (1999). Transition from school to life. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Martin, J. E., & Marshall, L. H. (1995). ChoiceMaker: A comprehensive self-determination transition program. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 147-156.

Martin, J. E., Marshall, L. H., Maxson, L., Jerman, P., & Miller, T. L. (1996). The self-directed IEP. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Martino, L. R. (1993). A goal-setting model for young, adolescent at-risk students. Middle School Journal, 24, 19-22.

McGahee-Kovac, M. (1995). A student's guide to the IEP. Washington, DC: National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities.

Murtaugh, M., & Zetlin, A. G. (1990). The development of autonomy among learning handicapped and nonhandicapped adolescents: A longitudinal perspective. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19, 245-255.

Powers, L. E. (1996). Take charge for the future. Portland, OR: Oregon Health Sciences University.

Powers, L. E., Sowers, J., Turner, A., Nesbitt, M., Knowles, E., & Ellison, R. (1996). Take charge: A model for promoting self-determination among adolescents with challenges. In

L. E. Powers, G. H. S. Singer, & J. Sowers (Eds.), On the road to autonomy: Promoting self-competence in children and youth with disabilities. Baltimore: Brookes.

Sitlington, P. L., Clark, G. M., & Kolstoe, O. P. (2000). Transition education & services for adolescents with disabilities. Bostone: Allyn and Bacon.

Sitlington, P. L., & Frank, A. R. (1993). Success as an adult: Does gender make a difference for graduates with mental disabilities? Career Development of Exceptional Individuals, 16, 171-182.

Van Reusen, A. K., Bos, C. S., Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D. D. (1994). The self-advocacy strategy for education and transition planning. Lawrence, KS: Edge Enterprises.

Ward, M. J. (1988). The many facets of self-determination. NICHCY Transition Summary: National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities, 5, 2-3.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1992). Self-determination and the education of students with mental retardation. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 27, 302-314.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1994). Employment status and perceptions of control of adults with cognitive and developmental disabilities. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 15, 119-131.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1995). The Arc's self-determination scale: Procedural guidelines. Arlington, TX: The Arc.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1996). Self-determination as an educational outcome: Why is it important to children, youth, and adults with disabilities? In D. J. Sands & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds.), Self-determination across the life span: Independence and choice for people with disabilities (pp. 17-36). Baltimore: Brookes.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1997). Self-determination as an educational outcome: A definitional framework and implications for intervention. Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 9, 175-209.

Wehmeyer, M. L. (1998). Student involvement in transition-planning and transition-program implementation. In M. Wehmeyer & D. Sands (Eds.), Making it happen: Student involvement in educational planning, decision making and instruction. Baltimore: Brookes.

Wehmeyer, M. L., & Kelchner, K. (1995). Whose future is it anyway? A student-directed transition planning process. Arlington, TX: The Arc National Headquarters.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Kelchner, K., & Richards, S. (1995). Individual and environmental factors related to the self-determination of adults with mental retardation. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 5, 291-305.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Kelchner, K., & Richards, S. (1996). Essential characteristics of self-determined behavior of individuals with mental retardation. American Journal on Mental Retardation, 100, 632-642.

Wehmeyer, M.L. & Sands, D. (Eds.). (1998). Making it happen: Student involvement in educational planning, decision-making and instruction. Baltimore: Brookes.

Wehmeyer, M., & Schwartz, M. (1997). Self-determination and positive adult outcomes: A follow-up study of youth with mental retardation or learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 63, 245-255.

Zhang, D. (1999). The effect of self-determination instruction on high school students with mild disabilities. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Company.

Table 1

Frequency of Ratings on IEP Team Behaviors Before the Transition Planning Meeting

Teacher/IEP Team Activity	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Listening to the student/family about their future vision regarding the student's life after high school	27 (61%)	12 (27%)	4 (10%)	1 (2%)
Identifying the student's interests and preferences	31 (71%)	12 (27%)	1 (2%)	0
Identifying the student's needs	37 (84%)	7 (16%)	0	0
Incorporating the student/family's needs, interests, and preferences into a draft transition service plan	27 (62%)	16 (36%)	1 (2%)	0

Table 2

T Tests of IEP Team's Behaviors Before the Transition Planning Meeting

	n	M	t	p
Teacher's Experience				
5 years or less	23	11.13	2.24	.033*
More than 5 years	21	10.00		
Teacher's Degree				
Bachelor's	28	10.07	3.508	.001*
Higher than bachelor's	16	11.50		
Certification in MR				
Yes	26	10.69	.47	.64
No	18	10.44		
Experience in Transition Planning				
Yes	34	10.32	3.30	.002*
No	10	11.50		

*$p < .05$

Table 3

Frequency of Ratings on IEP Team Behaviors During the Transition Planning Meeting

Teacher/IEP Team Activity	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Helping the student identify available choices	30 (68%)	10 (23%)	4 (9%)	0
Facilitating the student to make his or her own decisions	30 (68%)	9 (21%)	5 (11%)	0
Allowing the student to take charge of some or all parts of the transition planning meeting	6 (14%)	23 (52%)	15 (34%)	0
Providing the student/family opportunities to review the developed transition plan	34 (77%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	0
Providing the student/family sufficient time for asking questions	34 (77%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	0
Responding to the student/family questions	38 (86%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	0
Having the student and/or family sign the transition plan after they understand and agree with the plan	40 (90%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	0
The opinions of the student and parents are not considered because they do not come to transition planning meetings	4 (9%)	10 (23%)	12 (27%)	18 (41%)
The teacher develops the transition plans for his or her students with no or little input from the student/family	2 (5%)	11 (25%)	19 (43%)	12 (27%)

Table 4

T Tests of IEP Team Behaviors During the Transition Planning Meeting

	n	M	t	p
Teacher's Experience				
5 years or less	23	19.04	2.47	.018*
More than 5 years	21	17.19		
Teacher's Degree				
Bachelor's	28	17.21	4.499	.000*
Higher than bachelor's	16	19.81		
Certification in MR				
Yes	26	18.85	2.02	.054
No	18	17.17		
Experience in Transition Planning				
Yes	34	17.85	2.534	.015*
No	10	19.20		

*$p < .05$

Table 5

Frequency of Ratings on Student Behaviors Before, During, and After the Transition Planning Meeting

Student Behavior	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Before the meeting, wants to be prepared for the meeting by talking to the teacher and/or parents	5 (11%)	11 (25%)	15 (34%)	13 (30%)
Before and during the meeting, expresses his or her own ideas about what he or she wants	7 (16%)	15 (34%)	12 (27%)	10 (23%)
During the meeting, actively participates in discussions	4 (9%)	19 (43%)	12 (27%)	9 (21%)
After the meeting, meets with school personnel to discuss the transition plan	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	24 (55%)	15 (34%)
During the academic year following the meeting, asks questions about the plan and wants to know progresses	2 (5%)	9 (21%)	13 (30%)	20 (46%)

Figure 1. Transition Planning Questionnaire (Section II)

Before developing transition plans for your students with MMD, to what extent do you (or does the IEP team) do each of the following activities?

Listening to the student/family about their future vision regarding the student's life after high school	F	O	R	N
Identifying the student's interests and preferences	F	O	R	N
Identifying the student's needs	F	O	R	N
Incorporating the student/family's needs, interests, and preferences into a draft transition service plan	F	O	R	N

During transition planning meetings, to what extent do you or does the IEP team do each of the following activities?

Helping the student identify available choices	F	O	R	N
Facilitating the student to make his or her own decisions	F	O	R	N
Allowing the student to take charge of some or all parts of the transition planning meeting	F	O	R	N
Providing the student/family opportunities to review the developed transition plan	F	O	R	N
Providing the student/family sufficient time for asking questions	F	O	R	N
Responding to the student/family questions	F	O	R	N
Having the student and/or family sign the transition plan after they understand and agree with the plan	F	O	R	N
The opinions of the student and parents are not considered because they do not come to transition planning meetings	F	O	R	N
The teacher develops the transition plans for his or her students with no or little input from the student/family	F	O	R	N

To what extent does the **student** do each of the following?

Before the meeting, wants to be prepared for the meeting by talking to the teacher and/or parents	F	O	R	N
Before and during the meeting, expresses his or her own ideas about what he or she wants	F	O	R	N
During the meeting, actively participates in discussions	F	O	R	N
After the meeting, meets with school personnel to discuss the transition plan	F	O	R	N
During the academic year following the meeting, asks questions about the plan and wants to know progresses	F	O	R	N

Legend: F = frequently, O = occasionally, R = rarely, N = never

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

...NCIL FOR EXCEPT...
1920 ASSOCIATION ...
RESTON, VIRGINIA 220...

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com